

Appl. No. 10/668,470
Amdt. dated October 7, 2004
Reply to office action of July 20, 2004

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 20, 2004. The Office Action rejected Applicant's Claims 1-3, 8, 11 and 13 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,453,230 ("Geurts"). The Office Action objected to Claims 5 and 18 as containing informalities. The Office Action also indicated that Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Office Action allowed Claims 19-26.

With this response, Claims 1, 4-7, 14 and 18 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the present application. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Allowed Claims and Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the allowance of Claims 19-26 and the indication that Claims 4-7, 9, 10, 12 and 14-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have rewritten Claims 4, 6, 7 and 14 in independent form. Thus, newly independent Claims 4, 6, 7 and 14 are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 1

Applicants' independent Claim 1 relates to a method for developing traffic messages. The method comprises obtaining traffic data that include a location description for each of the traffic conditions. The location description is converted into a location reference code. The method transmits the traffic message with the location reference code for broadcast to a plurality of end users. Claim 1 is not anticipated by Geurts because the combination fails to disclose or suggest every claim element recited by the claim. Specifically, Geurts does not disclose or suggest transmitting the traffic message with the location reference code for broadcast to a plurality of end users.

Geurts discloses a receiver that processes traffic messages broadcasted by a service provider. The traffic messages in Geurts may conform to the RDS-TMC, and the receiver appropriately decodes the messages to determine which area the particular message relates. The receiver passes on traffic messages to the driver that relate to an area of interest. (*see*,

Appl. No. 10/668,470
Amdt. dated October 7, 2004
Reply to office action of July 20, 2004

Geurts: column 3, lines 50-65; column 7, lines 9-26). Geurts fails to disclose transmitting the traffic messages for broadcast to a plurality of end users. Rather, Geurts discloses receiving broadcasted traffic messages and passing them onto the individual driver. Geurts teaches away from the recited claim element because Geurts discloses a system for using previously developed and broadcasted traffic messages, not developing traffic messages for broadcast to a plurality of end users.

Accordingly, because Geurts fails to disclose or suggest all of the recited claim elements, Applicant's Claim 1 is not anticipated by Geurts.

Applicant's dependent Claims 2-3, 5, 8-13 and 15-18

Applicant's dependent Claims 2-3, 5, 8-13 and 15-18 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

Second Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants have filed a second information disclosure statement on October 7, 2004. A courtesy copy is attached for convenience.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the Office Action mailed July 20, 2004 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza Drive, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.